

Amend Claim 5 as follows:

a²
5. (Amended) A rotating machine as set forth in claim 4 wherein the electromagnetic steel plate are interlocked relative to each other by series of partially punched openings forming holes and projections, which inter-fit with each other so as to line up the electromagnetic steel plates in relationship to each other and to provide a mechanical coupling there between, said partially punched openings being provided in each tooth of the stator core.

Amend Claim 7 as follows:

a³
7. (Amended) A rotating machine as set forth in claim 1 wherein the spacing of the poles of said permanent magnets and their number and the number and spacing of the coils being set so that if the degree of rotation during which each coil experiences a complete cycle of electrical current is taken as 360° the circumferential extent of each of the magnet poles (the magnet electrical angle) lies in the range of 120° to 140° of such relative rotation.

[Cancel Claim 8 without prejudice.]

[Amend Claim 9 as follows:]

9. (Amended) A rotating machine as set forth in claim 7 wherein the machine comprises an electrical generator.

REMARKS

Turning first to the Office Action, it is noted that it fails to acknowledge the Information Disclosure Statement which was filed on February 27, 2002. It is assumed that that did not reach the Examiner by the time he had prepared the Office Action. However, the Examiner is most courteously solicited now address this I.D.S.

With respect to the drawings, enclosed herewith is a proposed revision to FIGS. 5 and 6, which should permit the Examiner to read all legends.

Also enclosed is a proposed drawing, which is the same as that which has been submitted in Applicants' Assignee's co-pending application entitled " Single-Phase Multi-Polar Magnet Type Generator For Vehicles", filed December 20, 2000 under App. No. 09/742751, which also discloses this feature and claims it all be in a different combination. If the Examiner accepts this, it will be added to the application and the specification amended accordingly where required.

The Examiner's technical objections have been reviewed along with the art rejection and the claims have been amended so as to address the points objected to by the Examiner. Also, Claim 8 has been cancelled because it was not technically correct. It is believed that the